

## Malvern Hills District Council

### Personal Details:

**Name:** jeremy Owenson

**E-mail:**

**Postcode:**

**Organisation Name:** West Worcestershire Conservative Association

### Comment text:

Please find attached the comments by the Conservative Group at MHDC, and of the West Worcestershire Conservative Association

### Uploaded Documents:

**Download ([https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download\\_document?file=draft%2F1647854047\\_Boundary+review.docx](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1647854047_Boundary+review.docx))**

We are broadly supportive of the findings of the Electoral Commission, but would like to add the following comments based on the new proposed Wards.

### **Kempsey**

We recognize the request of the residents and the Parish Council to maintain the integrity of Kempsey village as a single ward. This, however, is an example of the issue highlighted in our original submission. Where you have a major parish such as Kempsey, and two smaller parishes with different needs (Croome D'abiot, Severn Stoke including the village of Kinnersley), the needs of the more rural areas, and particularly the southernmost rural areas, are potentially neglected by a Kempsey centric approach.

A compromise between the needs of the village and the needs of the wider community could be to ring-fence the urban area of Kempsey as a single Councillor Ward, encircled by a wider rural Ward.

### **Martley and Teme Valley**

Our view is that this ward is geographically too large, with the needs in the southern area quite different from the needs in the north. The ward should be split taking into account the views of the local electorate, particularly those expressed through the local parish councils.

### **Ripple**

We support the proposal to extend across to Bushley and Queenhill. These areas historically formed part of a larger Ripple Parish, which originally extended across the river.

There are concerns in the parishes of Queenhill and Holdfast regarding the splitting of these parishes from Longdon. If the commission felt that this was an issue, and as a means of addressing the rural areas versus Kempsey issue above, it may be an option to add Croome D'Abbitot parish to Ripple Ward, along with Bushley, and leave Queenhill and Holdfast with Longdon. Although Croome D'Abbitot is not contiguous with Earls Croome parish, this could be done if part of the Severn Stoke parish, east of the M5 (Dunstall Common) were transferred at the same time. The houses in this area are already associated with Earls Croome, with the common splitting over the two parishes. This is not as neat a division as the splitting of the parishes on the west side of the river, but may be a good compromise.

### **Wells and Welland**

We support the Commissions review of these two Wards, recognizing that Upton Hook and Welland are similar areas.

### **Powick**

We have a concern that the Ward continues to grow in size, stretching south to include the Hanley parishes. There is a clear difference between residents of Powick, and the proximity to Worcester, and residents of Hanley Castle, and the proximity to Upton. Indeed, the Parish of Haley extends to edge of Upton town on the Hanley Road.

The Challenge with this ward is that the parish of Powick is too populous to split without creating parish Wards. This means that smaller parishes such as Guarlford and Madresfield and the Hanleys are drawn into the sphere rather than split Powick and Callow End into two Wards.

Consideration should be given to splitting the Powick ward to create two separate Wards, to enable more fair representation of the southernmost parishes who look more toward Upton than Worcester.

### **Upton Upon Severn**

We support the view of a single member ward of Upton. The view from the Town Council that they consider the eastern side of the river to be similar to them are not reflected by the residents on that side of the river. If a two member ward is the preference of the town, consideration should be given to retaining Upton and Hanleys to some degree, by reducing the Powick ward to a single member, with the southern parishes rejoining Upton. However, we are happy with the proposed boundary of Upton as a single member ward.